DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 597 HE 017 321

AUTHOR Johnson, Lynn G.; And Others
TITLE Mobilizing the Faculty for Service: Attitudes toward University Sponsored Service Programs at Five State Universities. ASHE 1984 Annual Meeting Paper.
SPONS AGENCY Akron Univ., OH. Dept. of Educational Administration.
PUB DATE 12 Mar 84
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Educational (Chicago, IL, March 12-14, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; College Role; *Consultation Programs; Higher Education; *Professional Recognition; Questionnaires; School Community Relationship; *State Universities; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation; Teacher Role; Technical Assistance; Women Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *Public Service

ABSTRACT

Factors related to faculty willingness to participate in university-sponsored service programs were studied at five Ohio state universities. Of a random sample of 1,000 faculty members, 416 returned usable questionnaires. In addition to obtaining demographic data on respondents, information was gathered on the extent of faculty member's previous experience in service activities of specified kinds, aspects of service in relation to the institutions and faculty roles, and faculty members' views about the possible expansion of service programs. "External service programs" were defined as activities formally sponsored by some unit of the university and primarily including instruction or training; clinical and laboratory services; and research, consultation, and technical assistance. Respondents indicated their feelings toward expanding external service by the university, school or college, department, or by the individual faculty members. Multiple linear regression was used to identify the strongest predictors of faculty willingness to participate. Respondents tended to be favorable toward expanded service activity, but skeptical about rewards and recognition. Faculty women tended to be more positive than faculty men. A questionnaire, references, and a literature review are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED245597

MOBILIZING THE FACULTY FOR SERVICE: ATTITUDES TOWARD UNIVERSITY SPONSORED SERVICE PROGRAMS AT FIVE STATE UNIVERSITIES

by

LYNN G. JOHNSON
UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

PIETRO J. PASCALE
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

HAROLD YIANNAKI
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

HE 017 321

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lynn G. Johnson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ASHE Association for the Study of Higher Education
The George Washington University/One Dupont Circle, Suite 630/Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago, Illinois, March 12-14, 1984. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Support for this study was provided by the Department of Educational Administration, The University of Akron, through the good offices of Dr. John Blough, Department Head. Graduate students who helped develop the questionnaire were Howard Tritt and John Buchner. We are also grateful to Mrs. Katherine Morrison and Anastasia Koutsounaris for their assistance in preparing the manuscript, and to Dr. Carolyn Benz for statistical advice and assistance in coding the data. This paper was originally presented at the Annual Conference, Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois, March 12, 1984.

MOBILIZING THE FACULTY FOR SERVICE:

ATTITUDES TOWARD UNIVERSITY SPONSORED

SERVICE PROGRAMS AT FIVE STATE UNIVERSITIES

ABSTRACT

Although universities are under increased pressure to expand external linkages, faculty attitudes towards university-sponsored service programs have received little attention. This study examines factors related to faculty willingness to participate in such programs at five state universities. Respondents (N=416) tended to be favorable towards expanded service activity, but skeptical about rewards and recognition. Faculty women tended to be more positive than faculty men. Multiple linear regression was used to identify the strongest predictors of faculty willingness to participate.

MOBILIZING THE FACULTY FOR SERVICE: ATTITUDES TOWARDS UNIVERSITY SPONSORED SERVICE PROGRAMS AT FIVE STATE UNIVERSITIES

INTRODUCTION

The university's contributions to economic development is a matter of widespread interest today. Virtually every state in the nation now has development strategies which call for academic alliances with industry and government to foster technological innovation (National Governor's Association, 1983; Office of Technology Assessment, 1983). These strategies typically attach great importance to university involvement and tend to presuppose significant expansion of university public service.

Although the economic planners seldom question academia's capacity or willingness to serve society's technological needs, expansion of university services entails a number of problems which are well-known to members of the academic community. In addition to adjustments in thinking about the role and mission of the university, there are the problems of allocating or reallocating financial and human resources. It is the last of these -- human resources in the sense of faculty time and effort -- which will concern us here.

Any enlargement of the service function requires increased participation of the faculty. Faculty members, while not the sole resource, are certainly the major professional resource of the academic institution. Yet, remarkably little attention has been given to date in the rapidly increasing literature on academic linkages for economic development, or for that matter in the general literature on higher education, to the question of faculty participation in university-sponsored service activities.

This study was designed to help fill this void in the literature by examining attitudes towards service among faculty at five large state universities in the midwest. The purpose was to determine the extent of faculty willingness to participate in university-sponsored service programs and to identify the factors that might be related to a positive inclination or favorable disposition on the part of faculty.

LITERATURE REVIEW

External service can be examined from several different perspectives. There are a number of works which deal with the broad issues of the university's relationship to society. The literature on the academic organization and the academic profession affords another perspective, based on general theories of organizational and professional behavior. Finally, there have been a small number of studies which have dealt specifically with faculty attitudes towards and participation in various forms of service activity.

The University-Society Perspective

The increasing centrality of higher education to modern society has been noted by numerous writers (Ashby, 1958; Bok, 1982; Kerr, 1963; Millett, 1968). For all of these observers, the demise of "ivory tower" isolation seems both inevitable and problematic. For Ashby, the increasing encroachment by government on acadmic life poses the question of how to retain "autonomy without independence" (1958, p.92). Kerr (1963) writes of the multiplicity of services provided by the "multiversity" and stresses the need to balance external demands with the traditional roles of higher education. Bok (1982) endorses involvement in such areas as technological innovation, but warns against conflict of interest and diversion of faculty from their primary academic responsibilities.

Other sources, while recognizing the problems inherent in greater social engagement, lay greater emphasis on the challenges and opportunities it presents to higher education. A recent publication of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 1982) asserts that community service, far from being a peripheral issue, is the most critical policy question facing the university in the modern era. A fundamental rethinking of the relationship of higher education to its social, cultural, and economic environment is required, according to the authors of this report, and merely restating traditional academic values fails to do justice to the complexity of university-community interactions. Basic changes in research and instructional policies, in personnel practices, and in institutional structures are essential, they insist, in order to integrate service into the mission of the university and to encourage and reward those who provide it.

For some authors, the challenge to higher education begins with the need for greater clarity about the service function. In the words of Warren B. Martin (1977, p.vii),

> Faculty members in American colleges and universities sit on the three-legged stool of teaching, research, and service. But they rest uneasily there, because the legs of their stool are uneven. Teaching and research tend to balance out. Service, however, is short -- poorly conceptualized and erratically expressed.

Agreeing that definitions of service are typically "nebulous and ambiguous," Long (1977, p.82) calls for clearer institutional objectives for service activities. Anticipating that pressures on colleges and universities to be more service-oriented will continue to grow, Long also stresses the need for greater flexibility and for improved delivery mechanisms.

The theme of adaptability and flexibility has been echoed by many writers. Weathersby (in Kelley, 1983, p.1) argues that academic institutions

> must abandon their internal, status-quo focus (how to fill up classes, what are the needs of faculty) to an external, future-oriented focus (what services does the public need).

Lynton (1981) reports that many opportunities for education and training programs in cooperation with business and industry have been lost because of inflexibility on the part of institutions and their faculties. Cross (1981) argues that colleges and universities need to learn how to be more responsive to the private sector's service needs. A recent General Accounting Office report (GAO, 1983) concludes that adaptability is a key factor in the success of academic-industrial research linkages as well.

In a recent review of the literature on public service, Crosson (1983, p.1) contrasts rhetorical endorsements of service to society as an important function with the reality that "service is quite a distant third after teaching and research." To understand such anomalies requires looking at our subject from a second perspective, that of the academic organization.

The Organizational Perspective

Describing the university as "an open, loosely-articulated system which at times has ill-defined boundaries," Katz (1967, p.172) depicts university decision-making as informal and incremental. The fact that professional expertise resides in the faculty contributes to decentralization and sub-unit autonomy, with the result that it is difficult for officials with formal authority to take a position for the institution as a whole. The impact of professionalism on the university is summarized by Clark (1971,pp.244-245) as follows:

> Where professional influence is higher and there are a number of professional groups, the organization will be split by professionalism. The university and the large college are fractured by expertness, not unified by it.

It is not surprising then, that the university as a whole often seems slow to adopt a specific course of action, whether it be helping to remedy urban problems (Gardner, 1969; Ross, 1973) or entering into cooperative relationships with other organizations (Katz, 1967).

Another important dimension of the academic organization is the interplay of academic values and motivational patterns. Among the major factors which draw men and women into academic careers, according to Wilson (1979), are intellectual interests and a desire for autonomy. Research on the academic profession documents that faculty members exhibit a drive for excellence, tend to be inner-directed, derive satisfaction from teaching and the pursuit of knowledge, and place a high value on academic freedom (Blackburn, 1974). Academic people are willing to forego the monetary rewards of other careers in exchange for freedom from supervision and the ability to choose their tasks, colleagues, and intellectual pursuits (Marsh and Stafford, 1967).

Given such values and motivations, academics are concerned to control the environment within which they work. They achieve professional autonomy, as Baldridge (1971) has explained, through various "coping strategies" which reserve to faculty the rights to set standards, to determine the content of instruction and research, and to control the evaluation and reward system.

Thus, whether one looks at the academic organization in terms of decision-making structure or in terms of values, the result is the same: there is a

high degree of autonomy among its professional members. It might be said that a certain amount of voluntarism is present in any project involving faculty, and this may be even more the case when tasks go beyond those routinely carried out in classroom and laboratory.

In endeavoring to mobilize faculty for university-sponsored service programs, therefore, it is imperative to ascertain the factors which might enhance or detract from it. One possible detractor, for example, is the constraint of time. Katz (1967) notes that the demands of teaching and research leave little marginal time for additional activities. Blackburn (1974) writes that faculty typically work between 55 and 60 hours per week and are subject to stress from work overload. Their concern with respect to service, accordingly, is that it may simply be too time-consuming.

Participation might be enhanced, on the other hand, if various service activities are compatible with the professional interests of faculty. Blackburn (1974) notes that service can enrich classroom teaching and generate new research projects: "Academics return to their institution from external service wiser than they left" (p.90). Long (1977) emphasizes that service must be kept congruent with teaching and research and should not be permitted to detract from these functions.

There is also the possibility of using rewards to encourage participation. McKeachie (1979) questions whether faculty can be influenced to any significant extent by external rewards in the absence of intrinsic ones. Nevertheless, Votruba (1978), Hanna (1981) and others have suggested that since faculty effort tends to be focused on areas where pay, promotion, and tenure are

offered as extrinsic rewards, similar incentives should be provided in the case of continuing education and public service.

Recent studies confirm that a large gap does exist in the reward system between teaching and research on the one hand and service on the other. Hind (1971) found that among a sample of humanities and sciences faculty at Stanford, only three percent thought external service was "very" or "extremely influential" in the evaluation-reward process, and fifty-one percent saw external service as "not at all influential" (pp. 273-274). In a larger study involving 453 department heads at 134 institutions, Centra (1977) obtained similar findings: across all types of departments and all types of universities, public or community service was rated either eleventh or twelfth out of 13 possible factors for evaluating faculty. This low level of importance obtained both as an estimate of current practice and as an indication of the way respondents thought things should be. Finally, McCarthy's (1980) study of 156 universities disclosed that community service often plays no significant role in faculty evaluation, that when it is a factor it ranks far below teaching and research, and that evaluation of service when it is done at all is "subjective, informal, and capricious" (p.10).

Related Research

Relatively few empirical studies have been undertaken which deal specifically with faculty participation in external service programs. One of the largest surveys was conducted by Kanun (1975), who obtained responses from 2,346 faculty in the University of Minnesota system. Although Kanun's study was descriptive rather than analytical, the data are interesting.

Most of the Minnesota respondents (73 percent) perceived that helping solve community problems was a professional obligation. A substantial number (67 percent) had previous experience in community service, about one-third of them in more than one type of program. Asked whether they thought service involvement was antithetical to their professional interests, 75 percent replied negatively. On the other hand, only 30 percent felt that faculty could be adequately rewarded by promotion and salary increases for participation.

In Murphy's (1978) study of faculty in the Baltimore area, those who participated in service activities viewed it as their responsibility and were more positive than non-participants towards expansion of service programs. In contrast to Kanun's subjects, 89 percent of those in Murphy's sample thought that alterations in the formal reward structure would encourage faculty involvement.

An analysis of community service at two-year colleges in Ohio by Michaels and Boggs (1980) also identified more positive views among faculty with previous experience in service projects. In addition, greater participation in planning and developing external service programs was positively related to favorable attitudes.

Studies of continuing education and other non-traditional instructional services consistently report that previous participation and/or greater knowledge of the activity are positively related to favorable attitudes (Haddock, 1976; Medsker, 1975; Slamet, 1973). In fact, in most of this literature faculty views in general tend toward the positive side -- accompanied, however, by reservations about specific delivery systems (Ice, 1976),

by skepticism about rewards and perceptions of conflict with other roles (Nolan, Anderson, and Mowrer, 1977), or simply by the feeling that there are no compelling incentives (Patton, 1975). In one study of attitudes towards external degree programs at the University of Michigan (Johnson, 1984), perceptions of the feasibility of implementing a program in the faculty member's own field proved to be the strongest single predictor of receptivity, followed by the extent of the respondent's agreement with program goals.

Research results obtained to date on relationships between faculty attitudes and demographic characteristics have been mixed and inconclusive. Among Murphy's (1974) respondents, the majority of participants in service activities were senior and established faculty, typically older, male, tenured, and members of the graduate faculty. In Michaels and Boggs' study, (1980), female respondents were more positive than males, and no differences were found relative to age or rank. Studies of continuing education and external degree programs have likewise yielded few demographic differences, though professional school faculty have often been found to be more involved and/or more positive than arts and sciences faculty (Johnson, 1984; Kavanaugh, 1979; Patton, 1975; Porter, 1969).

In summary, our review of the literature suggests that the service role may be viewed from various perspectives. When examined in the broader context of higher education's increasing involvement with society, the expansion of university services has the potential of either further eroding the autonomy of the university or further strengthening its status as a central American institution.

Secondly, the literature on the university as a professionally-dominated organization points to the diffuse nature of authority and the prevailing norm of academic freedom. These features in combination underscore the volitional and voluntaristic character of faculty participation in service programs.

Finally, the empirical evidence confirms the ambiguity surrounding service and its evaluation and reveals the ambivalence in faculty attitudes towards it. On the one hand, generally positive views are reinforced by a sense of obligation, perception of need, and actual experience. On the other hand, these views are tempered by practical concerns about time, questions about the feasibility or desirability of specific projects, and doubts about the realities of recognition and reward. Few consistent patterns have been found relating attitudes to faculty characteristics.

METHODOLOGY

For the present study, data collection focused on service activities at five state universities in Ohio. As in many other states, recent planning for Ohio's higher education system has emphasized service linkages with business, industry, and other external constituencies (Ohio Board of Regents, 1982). However, to the authors' knowledge, no attempts have been made in the state prior to this research to assay faculty views on university-sponsored service programs.

Sample

A survey questionnaire was constructed as a means to gather data on faculty attitudes. The target population consisted of 2,987 teaching faculty, at the rank of Instructor and above, at the five state universities selected. These five institutions serve a total of approximately 94,200 students enrolled in a wide range of degree programs from the associate to the doctoral level.

A stratified random sample of 1,000 faculty members was drawn, with proportional representation from each of the target universities. During the Fall and Spring Semesters of 1982-83, the survey instrument was drafted, reviewed by a panel of faculty members representing a cross-section of disciplines, pilot-tested at two institutions outside of the study, and revised for distribution to the study sample.

The questionnaire was distributed by campus mail at the five participating universities early in May, 1983. A follow-up letter was sent to non-respondents in July. Characteristics of the population, sample, and return rates for each institution are shown in Table 1. A total of 416 persons returned usable questionnaires, for an overall response rate of 41.6 percent.

As may be seen in Table 1, the distribution of respondents by institution varies little from the sampling distribution. T-tests on key variables revealed no significant differences between early respondents (298) and those who responded after the follow-up letter (118). Rank and sex distributions among respondents closely resemble data for the five institutions reported by the Ohio Board of Regents (1983).

TABLE 1

POPULATION, SAMPLE, AND RETURNS BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Population		Sample		Respondents		Response Rates
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1	768	25.7	257	25.7	118	28.3	45.9
2	438	14.7	147	14.7	79	18.9	53.1
3	637	21.3	213	21.3	77	18.6	36.2
4	620	20.8	208	20.8	76	18.3	36.5
5	524	17.5	175	17.5	66	15.9	37.7
	2,987	100%	1,000	100%	416	100%	41.6

Design

The questionnaire asked faculty members to indicate the extent of previous experience in service activities of specified kinds, to respond to various aspects of service in relation to their institution and their roles as faculty members, and finally to indicate their feelings about the possible expansion of service programs. Basic demographic data were also requested.

"External service programs" were defined as activities formally sponsored by some unit of the university and primarily including (1) instruction or training; (2) clinical and laboratory services; and (3) research, consultation, and technical assistance.(See Appendix A for detailed definition). This definition specifically excludes volunteer work of an individual nature, private consulting, and disciplinary participation, and is largely consistent with that used by Crosson (1983, pp.6-7) in a recent review of the literature.

Questions concerning various aspects of service, derived from the literature review, covered such matters as the following:

- Feelings about past experience in service programs.
- External service in relation to mission.
- Service as a professional obligation.
- Time concern and conflict with other roles.
- Professional benefits and satisfactions ("Intrinsic Factors").
- Compatibility with professional interests.
- Impact on salary; on pay and promotion ("External Rewards")
- Feeling about participation "if adequate extra income" is received.
- Recognition for participation.
- University conditions related to service.

Faculty responses on these items and others were used as independent variables and subsequently subjected to statistical tests for possible relationship to faculty willingness to participate.

"Willingness Score"

The dependent variable, "Willingness to Participate," was derived from five parallel questions (items 8a-e). These items measure the respondents' feelings toward (a) university expanding external service, (b) school or college expanding external service, (c) department expanding external service, (d) own future involvement in external service, and (e) committing five hours per week to external service. Each of the component items had identical response categories: 1 = Very Negative; 2 = Somewhat Negative; 3 = Somewhat Positive; 4 = Very Positive.

Logically, each of these variables provides an indication of faculty willingness to participate in external service programs. Empirically, intercorrelations between the component items proved sufficiently high (from .57 to .86) to justify their combination into a composite "Willingness Score" for use as the dependent variable.

Statistical Procedures

Frequency distributions and means were computed to describe patterns of faculty response to questions concerning previous experience and feelings about various aspects of external service. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to determine relationships between selected independent variables and the willingness score. Finally, multiple linear regression techniques were applied to identify clusters of variables with the greatest power to predict variance in the dependent variable.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Results of the survey of five state universities are presented below. Major findings are summarized under four headings, corresponding to the research questions which guided data collection for this study: (1) to what extent are faculty willing to participate in external service programs sponsored by their universities? (2) To what extent are faculty already involved and how do they regard their previous experience? (3) How do faculty feel about the various features of external service activities? (4) What factors are the strongest predictors of faculty willingness to participate?

1. Faculty Willingness to Participate

Patterns of responses to the questions which form the willingness score are displayed in Table 2. The preponderence of positive responses is evident and especially striking when the "somewhat positive" and "very positive" categories are combined. It is also interesting to note the consistency of the most positive replies on the one hand, and the tendency on the other of the most negative responses to increase as the questions become more personal and more concrete. A substantial majority of the faculty sample, it is clear, are favorably inclined towards the expansion of service programs and also prepared to participate themselves.

The relationship of responses on these five questions to the dependent variable, Willingness Score, is illustrated in Table 3. The Willingness Score constitutes a 16 point scale, ranging from 5 to 20, based on responses to the five component questions.

TABLE 2

Distribution by Percentages of Responses

to Willingness Items for the Total Sample

Questionnaire Item	N	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive	Somewhat and Very Positive Combined
University Expanding External Service	405	3.2	17.0	51.6	28.1	79.7
College/School Expanding External Service	406	4.4	18.5	48.0	29.1	77.1
Department Expanding External Service	402	6.5	19.4	44.8	29.4	74.2
Own Future Involvement in External Service	405	8.6	16.5	45.4	29.4	74.8
Commiting 5 hours per week to External Service	397	14.6	22.4	34.5	28.5	63.0

The largest block of scores fall in the "intermediate" category with scores from 11 to 14. But within this category the balance is slightly tilted toward the more positive side, with 106 out of 176 cases having scores of 13 or 14, just above the midpoint of the scale. Moreover, respondents in the "Somewhat Willing" category (32.3 percent) are nearly twice as numerous as those in the "Somewhat Unwilling" category (17.4 percent). The grand mean for all respondents of 15.7 indicates the central tendency towards the more positive end of the Willingness Scale.

2. Previous External Service Activity

Survey respondents reported an average of 3.2 hours per week currently spent on external service activities, only slightly higher than the statewide average of 2.6 hours for all public university faculty (Ohio Board of Regents, 1983).

Few faculty (from 3.4 to 10.7 percent) reported "extensive" experience during the last three years in any of the three types of external service programs. "Minimal" or "Moderate" experience in Instruction or Training was indicated by 53 percent, and in Research, Consultation, Technical Assistance by 52.8 percent, while only 36.6 percent indicated any experience at all during this period in Clinical and Laboratory Services.

Roughly similar results occurred with respect to service involvement with various clientele groups: few faculty indicated extensive experience and substantial numbers reported no experience whatever. Minimal or moderate experience was reported with educational organizations (42.3), professional organizations (38.9), business/industry (36.5), individuals and community groups (34.4), social service agencies (29.9), health agencies (27.9), and governmental agencies (27.1).

TABLE 3

DERIVATION OF WILLINGNESS SCORE AND

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY LEVELS ON WILLINGNESS SCALE

Response Categories for Component Items*	Average Scores on Component Items	Willingness Score**	Willingness Scale***	Respondents N	Respondents %
Very Negative = 1	1.00-1.49	5-6	(1) Very Unwilling	23	5.7
Somewhat Negative = 2	1.50-2.24	7-10	(2) Somewhat Unwilling	70	17.4
	2.25-2.99	11-14	(3) Intermediate: Unwilling-willing	176	43.7
Somewhat Positive = 3	3.00-3.74	15-18	(4) Somewhat Willing	130	32.3
Very Positive = 4	3.75-4.00	19-20	(5) Very Willing	4	1.0

* Component items are the five variables, questions 8 a-e, listed in Table 2.

** The Willingness Score is the sum of the responses for questions 8 a-e for each respondent.

*** The Willingness Scale permits placing respondents at five levels of relative willingness to participate, based on the Willingness Score.

When asked to indicate their feelings about past experience in external service programs, a large majority of the respondents answered positively. Over a third (37.4 percent) were "Very Positive," nearly half (48.8 percent) were "Somewhat Positive," and only 13.8 percent were "Very Negative" or "Somewhat Negative."

3. Aspects of External Service

Attitudes of the faculty in this study towards various aspects of service involvement are summarized in Table 4, which shows mean scores on selected questionnaire items and displays the distribution of responses from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

Many respondents (63.4 percent) felt that external service was expected of them, and even more (72.0 percent) felt professionally obligated to participate. Most regarded service as an important part of their university's mission (82.8 percent), of their college's mission (77.0), and of their department's mission (70.9). About three-fourths (74.1 percent) also agreed that there are pressing needs for service outside the university in areas related to their fields.

Although faculty tended to respond positively at the level of goals or needs for service, they also indicated concerns about time and conflict with other duties. Over half (53.7 percent) felt that time spent on external service conflicts with other academic responsibilities. When the question was put in terms of preferences, 56.9 percent said they would rather spend any extra time in research and writing, and 39.6 said they would rather spend extra time on teaching and advising.

Table 4
SELECTED ASPECTS OF EXTERNAL SERVICE:
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY PERCENTAGES

Questionnaire Item	Mean Score	1= Strongly Disagree	2= Disagree Somewhat	3= Agree Somewhat	4= Strongly Agree	Somewhat & Strongly Agree Combined
Some participation expected by college/department (5 a)	2.7	17.7	18.9	35.9	27.5	63.4
Feel professionally obligated to participate (5 c)	2.9	15.0	13.0	39.8	32.2	72.0
External service is important part of my university's mission (5 h)	3.2	5.7	11.6	43.1	39.7	82.8
Important part of my school's/ college's mission (5 i)	3.0	8.4	14.6	42.9	34.1	77.0
Important part of my department's mission (5 j)	2.9	10.8	18.2	39.4	31.5	70.9
Pressing need for services in areas related to my field (5 e)	3.0	9.1	16.8	37.8	36.3	74.1
Time in external service conflicts with other academic responsibilities (5 d)	2.5	18.3	27.9	39.9	13.8	53.7
Service programs are very compatible with my professional interests (5 n)	2.9	10.3	19.5	40.9	29.3	70.2
Departmental recognition for service is important benefit for me (5 t)	2.5	19.7	22.0	43.5	14.8	58.3
Other department members attach great deal of importance to service (5 u)	2.3	21.2	38.7	31.8	8.4	40.2
Departmental recognition for service encourages faculty participation (6 g)	2.5	16.7	32.7	35.2	15.4	50.6
School/college recognition for service encourages faculty participation (6 h)	2.5	17.6	33.1	35.4	14.0	49.4
University recognition for service encourages faculty participation (6 i)	2.4	20.1	36.1	31.0	12.7	43.7
Participation has very little impact on my regular salary (5 v)	3.2	5.0	13.7	34.5	46.9	81.4
Participation has very little impact on my promotion and tenure (5 w)	3.0	6.7	21.2	34.4	37.7	72.1
Extra income from service is an important benefit to me (5 x)	2.3	30.9	25.4	29.2	14.6	43.8
Participation detracts from my private consulting (5 y)	1.8	43.2	34.4	17.6	4.8	22.4
With adequate extra income, would just as soon participate through University-sponsored program as on my own (5 z)	2.9	9.8	15.2	48.9	26.1	75.0

Nevertheless, respondents saw many professional benefits arising from service. A substantial majority (70.2 percent) agreed that external service programs are "very compatible with" their professional interests. This variable was highly correlated with several others, later combined under the label "Intrinsic Factors," which also drew largely positive responses. These factors, with percentages in agreement, were:

Professionally Beneficial/ Important: Items	Somewhat or Strongly Agree
· Personal association with people in other organizations.	90.6 percent
· Satisfaction of using my professional skills.	89.0 percent
· Professional growth and development.	83.5 percent
· Challenge of meeting external needs.	83.0 percent
· Professional visibility and reputation.	70.8 percent

In addition, most respondents tended to agree that external service programs are beneficial in improving faculty skills and knowledge (76.6 percent) and in stimulating faculty research (63.5).

Benefits of an institutional nature also received mostly affirmative responses. In decreasing order of combined "Somewhat" and "Strongly Agree" percentages, these benefits included:

Institutional Benefits: Items	Somewhat or Strongly Agree
· Goodwill and good public relations for the university.	96.8 percent
· Increased visibility for your academic department.	89.3 percent
· Students benefit from participation.	81.9 percent
· Enlarging sources of financial support for the university.	80.3 percent
· Establishing contact with potential students.	72.0 percent
· Generating revenue for departmental needs.	45.4 percent
· Identifying people who could become faculty.	31.8 percent

In contrast to professional satisfactions and institutional benefits, questions concerning individual rewards and recognition yielded more negative reactions. Although departmental recognition was important to many respondents (58.3 percent), only 40.2 percent agreed that other department members attach a great deal of importance to service.

Most faculty thought external service had "very little impact" on their regular salary (81.4 percent) or on promotion and tenure decisions (72.1 percent). Some faculty members (43.8 percent) indicated that extra income as remuneration from service activities is important. Relatively few (22.4 percent) thought that participation in university-sponsored programs would detract from private consulting.

Finally, questions as to whether institutional conditions encourage faculty participation produced mixed results, with most responses clustered in the "Somewhat Disagree" and "Somewhat Agree" categories. Program Support Services and Facilities/Equipment received slightly more favorable than unfavorable responses, while the reverse was true for other items. The latter, with percentages of "Somewhat Disagree" and "Strongly Disagree" responses combined, included the following:

Conditions Encourage Participation: Items	Somewhat or Strongly Disagree
· Financial policies for sharing costs and revenues.	58.2 percent
· Policies regarding faculty compensation	57.4 percent
· University recognition for faculty participation.	56.2 percent
· Financial procedures for expenditures and cost accounting.	54.3 percent
· Administrative guidelines/procedures for program approval and coordination.	53.5 percent

Despite the evidence that they were not entirely satisfied with the conditions of university-sponsored service programs, most respondents indicated that if they received "adequate extra income" they would "just as soon" perform external service through university sponsorship as on their own. Only 25.0 percent replied negatively, while 48.9 percent agreed somewhat and 26.1 percent agreed strongly.

4. Predictors of Faculty Willingness to Participate

A surprisingly large number of independent variables yielded high correlation coefficients in relationship to the Willingness Score. A favorable inclination on the part of faculty towards external service would appear to be associated with numerous factors, many of which were discussed in the preceding sections. For ease of handling, a number of closely related variables were combined, such as those dealing with Goal Agreement, Intrinsic Factors, Extrinsic Rewards, Time/Conflict Concerns, and University Conditions. Table 5 displays those which were adopted for multiple regression analysis with their Pearson Correlation Coefficients and significance levels.

As shown in Table 5, the strongest association with Willingness Score ($r=.63$) occurs in the case of Goal Agreement, a measure of agreement that service is an important part of the mission (university; school; department). Another strongly related measure ($r=.55$) is Intrinsic Factors, a composite of several items reflecting professional benefits or satisfactions from participation. A similar factor, Compatibility with Professional Interests, also has a moderately strong correlation ($r=.43$), as does the variable labeled Feelings about Previous Experience ($r=.43$).

Table 5

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR SELECTED VARIABLES IN RELATION TO WILLINGNESS SCORE: TOTAL SAMPLE

Independent Variables/Questionnaire Items	N	r	Significance
Goals and Needs			
a. Goal Agreement: part of mission (5 h,i,j)	416	.63	< .01
b. Professional Obligations (5 c)	407	.39	< .01
c. Perceived External Need (5 e)	405	.34	< .01
Previous Experience			
a. Extent of Past Experience (2 a-d)	416	.18	< .01
b. Feelings About Past Experiences (4)	297	.43	< .01
Time/Other Duties			
a. Time/Conflict Concerns (5 d,f,g)	416	-.27	< .01
Feasibility/Desirability			
a. Intrinsic Factors (5 k,l,o,p,s,t)	416	.55	< .01
b. Compatibility with Professional Interests (5 n)	406	.43	< .01
Recognition and Reward			
a. Doubts About Extrinsic Rewards (5 v,w)	416	-.32	< .01
b. Through University if Extra Income is Adequate (5 z)	376	.28	< .01
c. Recognition (Dept./Col./Univ.) (6 g,h,i)	416	.39	< .01
d. Detracts from Consulting (5 y)	375	-.06	N.S.
University Conditions Related to Service (5 a-l)	416	.33	< .01

As expected, the items which were combined as Doubts About Extrinsic Rewards (little impact on pay; on promotion and tenure) and Time/Conflict (conflicts with other duties, prefer to spend time on teaching; on research) were negatively related to Willingness Score, but in their combined forms they are only moderately related (r=.32 and .27 respectively) to faculty willingness.

The variables listed in Table 5 were subjected to multiple linear regression analysis. The stepwise regression procedure employed is a method of progressive selection of the variables constituting the strongest possible predictive model. Output includes Pearson correlation Coefficient (r), multiple correlation coefficient (R), multiple correlation coefficient squared (R^2, unadjusted and adjusted) and the significance level. The R^2 can be understood as the percentage of variance in the dependent variable explained by all the independent variables included in the regression model (McNeil, Kelley, and McNeil, 1975).

Table 6 displays the results of regression analysis for the total sample. All correlations are significant at the level of $p<.01$. In the order in which they were selected by the stepwise procedure, the predictors are: (1) Goal Agreement; (2) Recognition for Service; (3) Compatibility with Professional Interests; (4) Through University if Extra Income is Adequate; (5) Time/Conflict Concerns; and (6) Feelings about Previous Experience. The R^2 adjusted of .56 indicates that 56 percent of the variance in Willingness Score is explainable by these six predictors in combination.

Most of the variables in the regression model had been identified as important in the literature review. The regression analysis confirms that

Table 6

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS - STEPWISE PROCEDURE FOR THE PREDICTION OF WILLINGNESS SCORE: TOTAL SAMPLE

Steps	Independent Variables	N	r	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Significance
1.	Goal Agreement: Part of Mission (5 h,i,j)	416	.63	.63	.40	.40	< .01
2.	Recognition (Dept./Coll./Univ.) (6 g,h,i)	416	.39	.67	.45	.44	< .01
3.	Compatibility with Professional Interests (5 n)	406	.43	.70	.49	.48	< .01
4.	Through University If Extra Income Adequate (5z)	376	.29	.72	.51	.51	< .01
5.	Concern About Time (Time/Conflict) (5 d,f,g)	416	.27	.73	.54	.53	< .01
6.	Feelings About Previous Experience (4)	297	.43	.75	.57	.56	< .01

endorsement of service program goals and perceived congruence of service activities with professional interests are positively related to willingness to participate. Also confirmed is the assumption that doubts about recognition and concerns about time and conflict with other roles are associated with a less favorable disposition towards service. Feelings about Previous Experience is clearly a strong predictor, and might be even stronger were it not for the large number (119) of missing cases representing respondents who had not had such experience. The inclusion of the variable labeled Through University if Extra Income is Adequate, instead of the Extrinsic Rewards variable, may suggest that for some faculty at least, willingness is more strongly linked to direct and immediate compensation than to the less certain, less immediate influence participation may have on salary, promotion, and tenure.

Although the model shown in Table 6 may be regarded as strongly predictive for the sample as a whole, it is important to determine whether it works as well for various subgroups. Earlier analysis of the demographic data had revealed few significant correlations between willingness and faculty characteristics, with one important and wholly unexpected exception: sex.

Analysis of variance tests by sex, it was discovered, produced statistically significant differences between males and females on numerous items. Female respondents reported more extensive experience in service programs overall, and except for business/industry and government, more service experience with various external constituencies. Females tended to exhibit a stronger sense of obligation to perform service, were more inclined to regard it as part of the mission, and were more likely to view service as professionally beneficial. They were less likely than

male respondents to think service detracts from consulting. They generally reacted more favorably to the expansion of service programs and to their own future involvement.

Given this unexpected pattern of differences between male and female faculty, separate regression analyses were performed for each group. The stepwise regression procedure for male respondents (N=325) added a seventh variable, Intrinsic Factors, as the final item and produces an R^2 of .63.

The same procedure for female respondents (N=85), however, yielded a very different model. This predictive model reached its limits after only two variables had been selected, Intrinsic Factors and Detracts from Consulting, and explained 69 percent of the variance in Willingness Score (R^2 = .69).

The negative correlation between the Consulting variable and Willingness was expected, but apart from the fact that female respondents were less concerned than males about service detracting from private consulting, it is difficult to explain why this variable emerges at this point instead of so many other more likely candidates. The presence of Intrinsic Factors, on the other hand, is consistent with the tendency of female respondents to rate more highly such professional benefits as growth and development, the challenge of meeting external needs, and professional visibility and reputation. Apparently these considerations carry more weight among female faculty as enhancing participation, whereas detractors such as time concerns or doubts about recognition and reward are relatively less decisive for them than for male faculty.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Considering the almost universal approbation of the formula, "Teaching, Research, and Service," it is remarkable that so much ambiguity still surrounds the service function of the university. The uncertain status of service is a matter of urgent concern today, however, when higher education is increasingly being called upon to play a larger part in economic development and to contribute to other social objectives.

The literature on higher education reflects a pattern of uneasy relations between the university and society, a sense that increasing centrality to American life is a mixed blessing. Analysis of the academic organization and of the norms, values, and motivations of its professional members suggests that service is not well-integrated into the work roles of faculty members. Expectations and rewards for its performance remain unclear, which lends a somewhat voluntaristic character to service activity. The limited number of empirical studies on faculty participation indicate that while tending to be positive in general terms, faculty members see little connection between service and their salaries or advancement and need to weigh the institutional and personal benefits against constraints of time and potential conflict with other duties.

This study of faculty at five state universities was designed to test some of these themes from the literature, to ascertain faculty views on external service, and to determine what factors are related to faculty willingness to participate.

The respondents to our survey proved to be somewhat more positive than might have been anticipated. Many had some if not extensive involvement in

service programs, and a large majority reacted positively to the proposal that such programs be expanded at their institutions. Over half responded favorably to the suggestion of commiting five hours per week to service activities.

At the same time, the data also reflected the ambivalance of faculty which has been noted elsewhere. On the one hand, respondents felt there were needs to be met, expressed a sense of obligation to meet them, and tended to agree that this was part of their university's mission. The advantages to themselves were more intrinsic than external, as substantial numbers indicated doubts about recognition or reward, and appeared to be somewhat dissatisfied with university arrangements for service programs. Slightly more than half felt that service conflicts with other academic responsibilities.

In terms of statistical analysis, it proved to be possible to explain 56 percent of the variance in respondents' Willingness Score by a combination of six variables. These predictors, as summarized in Table 6, referred to agreement that service is part of the mission, perceived extent of recognition for service, compatibility with professional interests, willingness to participate if adequately paid, concerns about time, and feelings about previous experience.

The fact that women respondents tended to be more positive about service and were especially responsive to intrinsic benefits associated with it was an interesting and unanticipated finding. Is it true that men are better rewarded for service and that, nevertheless, women devote more time to it, as Crosson suggests (1983, p.107)? The possibility that faculty women may be more service-oriented and less concerned about external rewards for service than faculty men opens up an important avenue for future research.

For academic institutions interested in responding to the needs of their states and regions in such areas as economic development, there are a number of steps which might be taken.

(1) Colleges and universities can clarify their goals in the area of service. The vague references found in many mission statements seldom reflect such clarity.

(2) Given the importance that faculty in this study attached to their professional interests in service, institutional initiatives should focus on areas of faculty strength and should be shaped, with faculty input, in ways which will permit faculty participants to reap professional benefits from their involvement.

(3) Expectations concerning faculty participation in service and the ways in which faculty service will be evaluated and rewarded need to be clarified also. By the same token, ways should be found to recognize faculty service contributions just as outstanding teaching and research accomplishments are often recognized.

(4) In light of the number of respondents who responded positively to participation on the condition that adequate compensation is received, institutions should examine their policies for paying faculty for service activities. Wherever possible and appropriate, arrangements should be made to ensure that faculty receive fair reimbursement at market rates for extra time and effort.

(5) Finally, institutions wishing to enlarge or strengthen their service program might review their administrative arrangements for such projects to be sure that policies and procedures actually encourage rather than discourage faculty participation.

The extent to which service can ever be fully-integrated into academic work remains an open question. Some of the writers referenced herein hold that the future viability of higher education may hinge on the answer. In any event, the research reported here suggests that while there may always be some tension between the service thrust and the demands of other academic pursuits, many faculty members are willing to contribute more to society through the service role, and their institutions need to do more to encourage them.

REFERENCES

Ashby, Eric. (1958). Technology and the academics. London: MacMillan and Co. Ltd.

Baldridge, J. Victor. (1971). Environmental pressure, professional autonomy, and coping strategies in academic organizations. In J. Victor Baldridge (Ed.), Academic governance (pp 507-530). Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company.

Blackburn, R. T. (1974). The meaning of work in academia. In J. T. Doi (Ed.), Measuring faculty effort (pp. 75-99). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bok, D. (1982). Beyond the ivory tower: Social responsibilities of the modern university. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Centra, J. A. (1977). How universities evaluate faculty performance: A survey of department heads. GRE Board Research Report No. 75-56R. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Clark, Burton R. (1971). Faculty organization and authority. In J. Victor Baldridge (Ed.) Academic governance (pp. 236-250). Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company.

Cross, K. Patricia. (1981). New frontiers for higher education: Business and professions: Current issues in higher education, No. 3: Partnerships with business and the professions. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Crosson, Patricia H. (1983). Public service in higher education: Practices and priorities. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 7. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Gardner, J. W. (1964, Winter). The university and the cities. Educational Record, 50, 5-8.

General Accounting Office. (1983, March). The federal role in fostering university-industry cooperation. Washington: United States General Accounting Office.

Haddock, M. D. (1976). Course assignments and attitudes of faculty and students toward off-campus courses at Auburn University and Auburn University at Montgomery. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University. Auburn, Alabama.

Hanna, D. E. (1981). Strengthening collegiate faculty rewards for continuing education. In J. C. Votruba (Ed.), New directions for continuing education (pp. 43-50). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hind, Robert R. (1971). Analysis of a faculty: Professionalism, evaluation, and the authority structure. In J. Victor Baldridge (Ed.), Academic governance (pp. 264-291). Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company.

Ice, J. T. (1976). Relationship between potential for change through non-traditional approaches and practices and institutional climate in selected graduate programs at the state colleges of New Jersey. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University.

Johnson, Lynn G. (1984). Faculty receptivity to an innovation: A study of attitudes towards external degree programs. Journal of Higher Education, 55 (4): (forthcoming).

Kanun, C. (1975). Patterns of response: Faculty community service survey. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Continuing Eduation and Extension Research Department. ED 107 882.

Katz, Daniel. 1967. A systems approach to the study of the internal problems and the external relationships of the university. In L. C. Howard (Ed.), Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, Institute of Human Relations.

Kavanaugh, M. J. (1979). A study of faculty attitudes toward continuing education programs offered through the Division of Continuing Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama.

Kelly, M. (Ed.) (1983, July). Administrator: The management newsletter for higher education, 2 (14), 1-4.

Kerr, Clark. (1972). The uses of the university (2nd ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Long, Durward (1977). The University as commons: A view from administration. In Warren B. Martin (Ed.) Redefining Service, Research, and Teaching (pp. 75-86). New Directions for Higher Education No. 18. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lynton, Ernest A. 1981. A role for colleges in corporate training and development. Current issues in higher education, No. 3: Partnerships with business and the professions. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Marsh, J. F., and Stafford F. P. (1967). Effects of values on pecuniary behavior: The case of academicians. American Sociological Review, 32 (5), 740-754.

Martin, Warren B. (1977). Teaching, research, and service -- but the greatest of these is service. In Warren B. Martin (Ed.), Redefining Service, Research and Teaching (pp. vii-ix). New Directons for Higher Education No. 18, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCarthy, Marianne B. (1980, May). Continuing education service as a component of faculty evaluation. Lifelong learning: The Adult Years 3 (9), 5-25.

McKeachie, W. (1979). Perspectives from psychology: Financial incentives are ineffective for faculty. In D. R. Lewis & W. E. Becker (Eds.), Academic rewards in higher education (pp. 3-20). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Medsker, L. and Associates. (1975). Extending opportunity for a college degree: Practices, problems, potential. Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

Michaels, D. F., & Boggs, D. L. (1980). Community services: Community college faculty perceptions and participation. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 4(2), 137-149.

Millett, J. D. (1968). Decision-making and administration in higher education. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Murphy, M. T. (1974). Faculty in public service activities in Baltimore higher education institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

National Governors' Association. (February 1983). State initiatives in technological innovation: Preliminary report of survey findings. Mimeographed. Washington, D. D.: Author.

Nolan, M. F., Anderson, L. A., & Mowrer, J. L. (1977). Faculty attitudes towards a non-traditional studies program. Alternative Higher Education, 2 (1), 17-24.

Office of Technology Assessment.(1983). Technology, innovation, and regional economic development. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Ohio Board of Regents. (1983) Basic data series. Columbus, Ohio: Author.

Ohio Board of Regents. (1982). Master plan for higher education. Columbus, Ohio: Author.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (1982) The university and the community: Problems of changing relationships. Paris: Author.

Patton, Carl V. (1975). Extended education in an elite institution. Journal of Higher Education, 46 (4), 427-444.

Porter, L. (1969). Faculty attitudes toward selected aspects of a multidimensional university continuing education college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University.

Ross, B. H. (1973). University-city relations: From coexistence to cooperation. ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 3. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Slamet, M. (1973). An analysis of faculty attitudes toward the cooperative extension service of Louisiana State University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Louisiana State University.

Votruba, J. C. (1978). Faculty rewards for university outreach: An integrated approach. Journal of Higher Education, 49 (6), 639-648.

Wilson, L. (1979). American academics then and now. New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS

The questions which follow deal with one aspect of university involvement in the community, namely those programs which are sponsored by some unit of the university for the purpose of service.

Definition: "External service programs" are activities which are formally sponsored by a department, college/school, or other university unit. Such programs primarily include:

Instruction or Training
Workshops, seminars, conferences and courses which augment the regular curriculum and are usually offered to external individuals and groups.

(These may be credit or non-credit, on-campus or off-campus).

Clinical and laboratory services
Services offered to the community in a clinical or lab setting which include a training component for degree students.

(These may be gratis or for a fee, on-or off campus).

Research, consultation, and technical assistance
Services involving problem-solving, analysis, evaluation, design or developmental assistance.

(These may be paid or unpaid, and may involve a grant or contract or simply an arrangement between the institution and the client).

Please note that the questions which follow do not apply to activities of a purely individual nature even though they may represent important contributions to community or profession. Thus, volunteer work, private consulting, or disciplinary participation are specifically excluded from consideration hereafter unless they are formally sponsored by some unit of your university.

---

1. Please consider now your own involvement in external service programs as defined above. On the average, how many hours per week do you spend on:

   a) external service programs only (as defined above)? Total hours per week: ____

   b) all of your academic responsibilities combined? (teaching, research etc.--i.e., all academic activities, including external service) Total hours per week: ____

2. During the last three years, how much experience have you had with each of the major types of external service program?

(Please circle one response per item).	None	Amount of Experience Minimum	Moderate	Extensive
a) the instructional or training type of external service program:	1	2	3	4
b) the clinical/lab services type of external service program:	1	2	3	4
c) the research, consultation, technical assistance type of external service program	1	2	3	4
d) any other form of external service program:	1	2	3	4

Please name: _____

3. During the last three years, how much experience have you had with each of the following types of clientele in external service programs?

(Please circle one response per item).	None	Amount of Experience Minimum	Moderate	Extensive
a) business and industry	1	2	3	4
b) social service agencies	1	2	3	4
c) health service agencies	1	2	3	4
d) educational organizations	1	2	3	4
e) governmental agencies other than above	1	2	3	4
f) professional organizations other than above	1	2	3	4
g) individuals and community groups other than the above	1	2	3	4

Please name: _____

	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive
4. In general, how do you feel about your past experience in external service activities?	1	2	3	4

5. Assume that you are the subject of the following statements. Please indicate to what extent you would disagree or agree with each. (Please circle one response per item).	DISAGREE - Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	AGREE - Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree
a) Some participation in external service programs is expected of me by my college/department.	1	2	3	4
b) Some participation in external service programs is part of my contract or job description.	1	2	3	4
c) I feel professionally obligated to participate in external service programs.	1	2	3	4
d) Time spent in external service programs conflicts with my other academic responsibilities.	1	2	3	4
e) There is a pressing need outside the University for external services in areas related to my field.	1	2	3	4
f) I would get more satisfaction from spending any extra time in teaching and advising.	1	2	3	4
g) I would get more satisfaction from spending any extra time in research and writing.	1	2	3	4
h) In my opinion, external service is an important part of my University's mission.	1	2	3	4
i) In my opinion, external service is an important part of my school/college mission.	1	2	3	4
j) In my opinion, external service is an important part of my department's mission.	1	2	3	4
k) Personal association with people in other organizations is an important benefit of external service.	1	2	3	4
l) Professional growth and development is an important personal benefit of external service.	1	2	3	4
m) At this time, I do not feel my skills and expertise correspond to the needs of outside groups.	1	2	3	4
n) External service programs are very compatible with my own professional interests.	1	2	3	4
o) The satisfaction of using my professional skills is one of the important features of external service.	1	2	3	4
p) The challenge of meeting external needs is one of the important aspects of external service.	1	2	3	4
q) External service programs have potential for my research pursuits and publications.	1	2	3	4
r) External service programs which involve my students' participation are very beneficial to them.	1	2	3	4
s) The professional visibility and reputation associated with external service is an important benefit for me.	1	2	3	4
t) Recognition within my department for my contributions to external service is an important benefit to me.	1	2	3	4
u) Other faculty members in my department generally attach a great deal of importance to external service activities.	1	2	3	4
v) Participation in external service has very little impact on my regular salary.	1	2	3	4
w) Participation in external service has very little impact on my promotion and tenure.	1	2	3	4
x) Extra income as remuneration from external service programs is an important benefit for me.	1	2	3	4
y) Participation in university-sponsored external service programs detracts from my private consulting.	1	2	3	4
z) Provided that I receive adequate extra income for my external service activities, I would just as soon do it through a University-sponsored program as on my own.	1	2	3	4

6. To what extent do you disagree or agree that each of the following conditions at your university are conducive to encouraging faculty participation in external service programs?	DISAGREE - Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	AGREE - Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree
a) administrative guidelines and procedures for program approval and coordination.	1	2	3	4
b) facilities and equipment for operating programs.	1	2	3	4
c) program support services (registration, AVS, catering, etc.)	1	2	3	4
d) financial procedures for expenditures and cost accounting.	1	2	3	4
e) financial policies for sharing costs and revenues.	1	2	3	4
f) policies regarding faculty compensation.	1	2	3	4
g) departmental recognition for faculty participation.	1	2	3	4
h) college/school recognition for faculty participation.	1	2	3	4
i) university recognition for faculty participation	1	2	3	4
7. To what extent do you disagree or agree that external service programs are beneficial by --				
a) generating goodwill and good public relations for the university?	1	2	3	4
b) enlarging sources of financial support for the university?	1	2	3	4
c) increasing visibility for your academic department?	1	2	3	4
d) improving faculty skills and knowledge?	1	2	3	4
e) stimulating faculty research?	1	2	3	4
f) identifying people who could become faculty?	1	2	3	4
g) establishing contact with potential students?	1	2	3	4
h) generating revenue for departmental needs?	1	2	3	4
8. In general, how do you feel about:	Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	Somewhat Positive	Very Positive
a) Your university expanding external service programs?	1	2	3	4
b) Your school or college expanding external service programs?	1	2	3	4
c) Your department expanding external service programs?	1	2	3	4
d) Your own future involvement in external service programs?	1	2	3	4
e) Committing at least five hours of your own time per week to external service, in the event that such programs are expanded?	1	2	3	4

9. Additional Comments. Please use the space below for any additional comments you may wish to make on this subject. In particular, what factors most enhance participation in external service programs? What factors most detract?

10. Now we would like to ask a few questions about yourself. Your responses will remain anonymous, but when aggregated with those of other respondents will help us in the analysis of survey results. (Please check one answer per question).

a) Your sex: Male _____ Female _____

b) Your age: Below 31___ 31-40 ___ 41-50 ___ 51-60 ___ Above 60 ___

c) Your rank: Instructor ___ Asst. Prof. ___ Assoc. Prof. ___ Prof. ___

d) Tenure: Not Tenured ___ Tenured ___

e) Your highest degree: Bachelors ___ Masters ___ Other Professional ___ Doctorate ___

f) Your faculty load consists of:

Full-time Instruction ___ | Partly Instruction/ Partly Research ___ | Partly Instruction/ Partly Administration ___ | Part-time Instruction Only ___

g) Your annual instructional load (teaching only) as a percentage of a total, normal load at your institution is:

25% or less ___ 25%-50% ___ 51%-75% ___ 76%-100% ___

h) Years of academic employment (all college/university experience):

1-5: ___ 6-10: ___ 11-15: ___ 16-20: ___ 21-25: ___ 26 or more: ___

i) Years of full-time employment outside of higher education:

None: ___ 1-3: ___ 4-6: ___ 7-9: ___ 10-12: ___ 13 or more: ___

j) In terms of personal enjoyment, how would you rank the following:

First choice = 1, Second choice = 2, Third choice = 3, Fourth choice = 4

Teaching/Advising	Research	Internal Service	External Service
_____	_____	_____	_____

k) At what academic level do you do most of your teaching? Lower Division___ Upper Division___ Masters Level ____ Doctoral Level ____

l) Your research interests: Highly Applied ____ Mixed Applied/Theoretical ____ Highly Theoretical ____

m) Your salary, compared to the average salary within your school/college:

Below Average ____ About Average ____ Above Average ____

n) The adequacy of your salary from your own viewpoint:

Inadequate ____ Barely Adequate ____ Adequate ____ More Than Adequate ____

o) Your academic discipline: _____

p) Your academic affiliation within your university:

Two-Year Division ____ Arts & Sciences ____ Professional College ____

q) Are you licensed or certified to practice any occupation or profession in addition to your academic position? Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, please name: _____

********** THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN FILLING OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE **********

Please return your completed questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope.

If you would like to receive a copy of the survey results in summary form, please clip along the dotted line below, print your name and office address, and send by campus mail to the address shown.

. . . . . .

REQUEST FOR SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS:

NAME (please print): _____

UNIVERSITY OFFICE ADDRESS: _____

_____

Please return to: _____ (Address shown on return envelope.)

_____